

10. In December, 1965, a 76 page booklet entitled "Education: An Answer to Poverty" was issued under the joint auspices of O.E. and O.E.O.

11. On January 11, 1966, a memorandum from the Director, Division of Program Operations, was sent to each Title I Coordinator stressing the importance of using Title I funds to extend and build upon the benefits to children who were a part of Summer Head-Start projects. (See Appendix "M").

12. The Description of Program Organization and Administration required of each State Department of Education requests a description of procedures established to insure coordination of Title I programs with Community Action Programs. (See Appendix "N" and "O" for an example of the leadership assumed by one State in promoting Title I-CAP coordination).

13. Plans are being made to conduct a joint evaluation of preschool programs. Samples will be drawn from both OE and OEO funded projects and the results of the two types of projects compared and contrasted.

14. A January 15, 1966 Interim Coordination Report on Title I requested of each State the details in the following areas: (See Appendix "P").

(a) Actions taken to date to coordinate with CAPS.

(b) Number of projects in local educational agencies that serve an area where there is an approved CAP.

(c) Total amount of Title I money approved for local educational agencies where there is an approved CAP.

15. After experience with draft guidelines, OE and OEO officials agreed that the final guidelines should state that a letter from the local CAP must be attached to each project application. This letter should state that the local CAP has seen he proposed Title I project and concurs or does not concur.

Discussions between Division of Program Operations personnel and CAP officials have culminated in agreement on a joint sign-off procedure.

Title I project applications will be accompanied by a check sheet indicating local CAP support of the proposed project. A suggested format to document Community Action support is included in the Revised Instructions. (See Appendix "Q"). Likewise, CAP proposals with education components will contain a check sheet indicating support of the local Superintendent of Schools. The omission of this check sheet in either case would serve as an alert to State education officials of O.E.O. regional personnel to inquire as to reasons for its omission.

EXAMPLES OF PROBLEMS IN THE FIELD

The San Francisco Community Action Agency protested in the form of a telegram that the San Francisco Unified School Districts' Title I projects had not been coordinated with them and asked for a hold-up in approval. Telephone conversations between area desk director, and Director, Program Operations, with Title I Coordinator and the Director of OEO's regional office kept the conflict at the local level. The issue was resolved around a series of events that included (a) temporary delay in approving the projects by the State Department; (b) meetings between representative of school board, CAP, and State Department; (c) review of projects by California advisory board for compensatory education with subsequent recommendation for approval to State board; and (d) agreement from San Francisco Unified School District that future projects will be worked out in conjunction with the Community Action Agency. San Diego was apparently watching this whole procedure with interest and changed some of its operations as a result of the outcome.

The Albuquerque Community Action Organization protested the school districts' project in applications to the State Department of Education for Title I funds. This conflict received some newspaper publicity. Members of the Field Services Staff and the Office of Disadvantaged and Handicapped had telephone conversations with State Department personnel, HEW's Dallas poverty coordinator, and OEO's Austin office. The issue was kept at the State level for solution when the Chief State School Officer and the Governor's technical assistance coordinator for poverty matters met. The Chief State School Officer subsequently issued an appeal and hearings procedure on Title I applications. To our knowledge this is the first action of this kind.

We are also in receipt of a copy of a letter from Mr. Ben Zimmerman, Executive Director of the Syracuse Community Action Agency, directed to Sargent Shriver for a specific definition of coordination and cooperation as used in 89-10 and also ask why one federal agency requires involvement of the poor in program planning while another administering legislation which affects the poor makes